

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,874	02/08/2001	Mikio Ihama	0042-0437P-SP	6673
2292	7590 05/18/2006		EXAM	INER
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			WALKE, AMANDA C	
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1752	
			DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/778,874	IHAMA, MIKIO					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Amanda C. Walke	1752					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover s	heet with the correspondence	address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS CON 136(a). In no event, however will apply and will expire SIZ a, cause the application to b	MMUNICATION. er, may a reply be timely filed X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this ecome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 F	ebruary 2006.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 19	35 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,6,9,17,18 and 21-24</u> is/are pen	ding in the applicati	on.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,6,9,17,18 and 21-24</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirem	ent.					
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		cted to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correc	tion is required if the	drawing(s) is objected to. See 37	CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the a	ttached Office Action or form	PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	n priority under 35 L	J.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
1. Certified copies of the priority document							
2. Certified copies of the priority document							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	_		al Stage				
application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	·						
See the attached detailed Office action for a list	. Or the certified cop	es not received.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 In	terview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		aper No(s)/Mail Date otice of Informal Patent Application (F	OTO_152\				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)Paper No(s)/Mail Date		olice of informal Patent Application (Fither:	10-132)				
<u> </u>							

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments/ amendments filed 2/24/2006, with respect to newly amended claim 1 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The examiner erred in indicating that claims 19 and 20 contained allowable subject matter in the previous office action, thus the rejection of claims 1-18, 21, and 22 has been withdrawn and a new rejection follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 17, 18, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brust et al (6,100,019) in view of Nishikawa et al (6,007,977) and Wen et al (5,536,632).

Brust et al disclose a silver halide photographic material comprising high bromide {111} tabular grains having a high chloride epitaxy. The grains are preferably silver iodochlorobromide and contain silver iodide in an amount of less than 10 mole %, and silver chloride in an amount of less than 10 % as well (column 3, line 53 to column 4, line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the emulsion using any amount within these ranges. Additionally, the inventive grains comprise either 0.75 mol % or 1.2 mol % iodide. The epitxial deposits may constitute only 0.1 % of the total silver, thus the chloride may be added in an amount as low as 0.1 mol %. The grains account for at least 90 %, most preferably greater than

Application/Control Number: 09/778,874

Art Unit: 1752

97 % of the total grain projected area, have a thickness of less than 0.2 microns, preferably less than 0.07 microns, an ECD of less than 6 microns, and an aspect ratio of at least 5 (column 5, lines 30-57). The grains may be hexagonal (column 7, lines 34-50). The grains contain high chloride epitaxies in the corners of the grains. The examples prepare grains having 6 epitaxial deposits, one in each corner of the grain, which implies that the grains formed by the examples are hexagonal grains. The pBr during emulsion preparation is preferably adjusted to be between 3.0 and 3.8, after the temperature has been set between 20 and 60 degrees C, and from looking at the inventive examples the temperature is preferably 40 degrees C (column 6, lines 45-67). The exemplified grains also contain one or more dislocation lines at the epitaxial junctions, demonstrating that the grains may have dislocation lines at the apexes of the grains. The material comprising the emulsion is coated on a support (column 10, lines 15-18).

Although the material does not specifically refer to the COV of the ECD of the grains, since the reference teaches that the emulsion should be monodisperse, that the COV would inherently be very low and would be less than less than the 30% and 20 % claimed given that it is most preferable for greater than 97 % of the emulsion to be comprised of the preferred grains which would have an ECD within the claimed range. The reference fails to disclose specific information on the edge lengths of the hexagonal grains.

Nishikawa et al disclose a silver chloroiodobromide {111} emulsion comprising hexagonal grains containing dislocation lines in the apexes of the grains (column 4, lines 1-46). The reference teaches that it is preferable for hexagonal grains to have a ratio of the longest side to the shortest side of 2 or less (column 3, lines 11-26), and further teaches that a monodisperse emulsion will have a low COV of the ECD (15 5 or less) of the grains.

Application/Control Number: 09/778,874

Art Unit: 1752

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the monodisperse high bromide {111} hexagonal grain emulsion of Brust et al using hexagonal grains having a ratio of the longest side to the shortest side of 2 or less given that it is taught to be preferable by Maruyama et al with reasonable expectation of achieving an emulsion having high sensitivity and graininess.

Wen et al disclose ultrathin silver iodobromide {111} grains similar to those of the other references, but demonstrates both high silver chloride epitaxies and silver chlorobromide epitaxies, wherein both bromide and chloride are present in the epitaxy, and the choride contant is less than 50 %. These grains exhibit increased contrast and decreased granularity (see table XV in column 41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the monodisperse high bromide {111} hexagonal grain emulsion of Brust et al in view of Nishikawa et al and modifying the epitaxies to be the AgIBrCl epitaxy of Wen et al with reasonable expectation of achieving an emulsion having increased contrast and decreased granularity.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda C. Walke whose telephone number is 571-272-1337. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 5:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amanda C Walke Primary Examiner Art Unit 1752

ACW May 9, 2006